

Woman's Sportsmanship
Disastrous to Burglar

Brooklyn Thief Gave Mrs. D. M. Moore \$70 Back, but She Had Him Arrested

From his experience of yesterday, a man who said he was Gustave Beilstein, of 483 Bushwick Avenue, Brooklyn, has concluded that it doesn't pay a burglar to be polite and generous to a woman. Choosing the noon hour as an auspicious time to enter the home of Mrs. Dorothy M. Moore, at 1304 Flatbush Avenue, Beilstein had carried his operations to the point of extracting \$127 from a pocketbook found in a bedroom, when Mrs. Moore appeared. She wasn't frightened, but went up to him and argued the point of sportsmanship to such purpose that Beilstein gave her back \$70. This he said he did with the understanding that sports-

Man's Reciprocal to the extent of giving him a fair chance to escape.

But the moment he got downstairs Mrs. Moore set out in pursuit. She kept Beilstein in sight until she reached Foster Avenue, where a policeman took up the chase in a commandeered automobile and captured the fugitive.

Four New Yorkers Are On A.E.F. Casualty List

WASHINGTON, Nov. 12.—The following casualties in the American Expeditionary Forces prior to November 11, 1918, have been discovered in a research of the records: Died of disease, 1; wounded severely, 5; wounded (degree undetermined), 4; wounded slightly, 9; total, 19.

Wounded severely, John J. Connelly, private, 102 Baltic Street, Brooklyn; wounded (degree undetermined), Charles J. Berman, private, 271 Vernon Avenue, Brooklyn, and Charles F. Eaton, private, 822 Elmore Place, New York; wounded slightly, John E. Kealey, sergeant, Schuylerville, N. Y., and William Geir, private, 335 Madison Street, New York City.

\$4,500,000 Waste In Building Camp Grant Is Charged

Congressional Investigators Told of Widespread Graft in Construction Work Costing \$13,500,000

ROCKFORD, Ill., Nov. 12.—Evidence purporting to show that more than \$4,500,000 was expended needlessly in building Camp Grant, and disclosures of alleged graft among workmen at the cantonment, enlivened the morning session of the Congressional sub-committee investigating the cost of the camp.

Three men testified that they and other workmen were mulcted by dishonest foremen and straw bosses. One man testified that the boss of a certain gang collected \$2 from each of his men for permitting them to earn overtime wages on Sunday.

Two teamsters alleged that a Rockford expressman, who claimed to have the exclusive contract for supplying teams to the camp contractors, collected \$2.20 a day for each of the 200 teams employed at Camp Grant for a period of nearly four weeks.

Interesting figures concerning the actual cost of the camp, which approximately was \$13,500,000, and the price for which the government might have built the cantonment upon a lump sum basis were given on the stand by J. P. O'Connor, contractor, of Chicago. O'Connor was retained by the sub-committee to make a survey of Camp Grant and prepare an estimate of the reasonable cost of construction.

The witness testified that the cantonment could have been built for \$8,819,544, as compared with the actual cost, which, as far as it has been tabulated, totals \$12,851,277.22, to which, according to government experts, there is yet nearly \$1,000,000 to be added.

Columbia Men Absolved Of Failure to Drill

Dean Blames Defects of the Organization for Students' Poor Showing

Defects of organization and not a desire to shirk has been responsible for the absence of many Columbia students from the military drill held Tuesday under the Slater law at the 22d Engineers Armory, Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, of Columbia College, said yesterday.

"The authorities of Columbia College," he asserted, "are making every effort to cooperate with those of the state in carrying out the provisions of the law. Every student who could be reached has been informed that he should present himself at the 22d Regiment Armory, as requested by the military officials, even though he were obliged to absent himself from important college work."

"Such defects of organization as have existed are due to initial difficulties naturally arising from the process of adjusting the machinery of the university to the requirements of the state. There is no desire or intention to evade the law."

Convicted of Perjury

Woman Says She Was 'Confused' in Accusing Contractor

Annie Mills, a negro woman who swore that Isaac Jersey, a Brooklyn contractor, was the father of her daughter, was convicted of perjury yesterday in the Kings County court. The jury returned the verdict after the woman had admitted on the stand that she had previously testified falsely, saying she was "confused" and acted on the advice of her two attorneys. She was remanded for sentence Monday.

Mr. Jersey recently instituted action against Rufus Perry, a negro lawyer, and United States Commissioner Felix Reifschneider, who had acted as counsel for the woman. Mr. Reifschneider took the stand as a witness and declared that he did not draw the complaint against Jersey. He said it had been drawn personally by the Mills woman.

Lansing Assures Americans Aid if Victims in Mexico

Secretary of State Says the Government Will Act if Our Nationals Are Not Given Protection

WASHINGTON, Nov. 12.—Secretary Lansing, in a statement to-day designed to make clear the government's attitude on the question of responsibility of Mexico for the safety of Americans in that country, declared it was "the privilege as well as the right of this government by diplomatic intervention to see to it that justice is accorded its citizens and their rights given proper protection."

Mr. Lansing explained that he issued his statement because some newspapers, in connection with the kidnapping of William O. Jenkins, American consular agent at Puebla, had made it appear that he had said "that Americans in Mexico had no greater rights to protection than Mexicans."

Says Mistake Was Made

"I regret," said Mr. Lansing, "that the context of my comments was not given in full, because it would have shown that I was referring to a condition in which the Mexican authorities had employed every means which they possessed or should have possessed to protect the lives and property of aliens in a community. If the authorities failed to provide means of protection or to use such means, the statement attributed to me would not apply."

To avoid being misunderstood as to this government's interpretation of the rule of international law on the subject of responsibility on the part of Mexico for the safety of Americans in that country, I make the following statement:

Text of Statement

"While in general there is presumed to be no difference between the rights of aliens and the rights of natives to be treated fairly and justly under local laws and by the local authorities, nevertheless should the operation of the local laws or the acts of commission or omission by local authorities result in injustice to Americans or lack of adequate protection of their lives or property, it is the privilege as well as the right of this government, under international law, by diplomatic intervention to see to it that justice is accorded to its citizens and their rights given proper protection."

"The reason for this is that when a condition of political unrest and lawlessness exists, such as obtains in certain parts of Mexico, aliens being denied proper protection by the authorities must rely on their government operating through diplomatic channels to obtain justice and security. This is a general statement and the basis of the policy followed by this government, though it

Is necessarily subject to modification in particular cases.

"It should be borne in mind, however, that the accepted law and practice of nations in that, as a rule, it must be shown that a foreign government is responsible for injustice done to aliens or that its constituted authorities are negligent in protecting their lives and property, before liability is incurred."

Captain of Jenkins Tries To Kidnap Puebla Bishop

SAN ANTONIO, Tex., Nov. 12.—Federico Cordoba, the bandit chief, who is charged with having kidnapped American Consular Agent Jenkins at Puebla, Mexico, made an unsuccessful attempt to capture Enrique Sanchez Paredes, Catholic Bishop of Puebla, a few days ago, according to information received by the bishop after escaping a trap set by the bandit, appealed to Federal authorities for protection.

\$30,000 Farm Near Philadelphia Enters Into Shonts Fight

Court Proceedings Reveal Former Head of I. R. T. Also Owned Property in the Suburbs of Chicago

It was revealed yesterday in the course of court proceedings precipitated by the action of Theodore P. Shonts in leaving most of his estate to his friend, Mrs. Amanda C. Thomas, that the former president of the Interborough occasionally led the life of a farmer on a 280-acre farm in the suburbs of Philadelphia.

The farm enters into the contest, begun by Mrs. Milla D. Shonts, the widow, because it was said Mr. Shonts owned no real property. This statement evidently meant that he owned no real estate in New York. Besides the farm Mr. Shonts owned several building lots in the suburbs of Chicago.

Both of these properties not being specifically devised in the Shonts will also become a part of the residuary estate and go to Mrs. Thomas, if the will stands. The farm is said to be worth from \$30,000 to \$50,000. It was well stocked with domestic and had up-to-date farming implements. It was never permitted to run down, for it was occupied the year round by farmer tenants of Mr. Shonts. Information that has come to Warren Dixon and George W. Files, attorneys for Mrs. Shonts, is that soon after Mr. Shonts died a van drove up to the farm house and that two or three negroes loaded the furnishings on the van and drove away.

The alleged removal of paintings and furniture valued at \$50,000 from Mr. Shonts's Park Avenue apartment, about which Mrs. Shonts had complained, and also the removal of the contents of the farmhouse, were explained yesterday by a person acquainted with the affairs of the estate. He said that in both instances the articles were placed in a storage warehouse vault by direction of the Shonts executor, the Laney Nicol, E. J. Berwind and the Guaranty Trust Company. They will be kept there pending the outcome of the will contest.

If the will of Mr. Shonts should be broken the real estate will go to his daughters, Theodore, Duchess de Chaulnes, and Mrs. Rutherford Bingham. Mrs. Shonts relinquished her dower rights in a separation agreement with her husband.

No news has been received by Mrs. Shonts from her daughter, the Duchess de Chaulnes, who was expected here from Paris, but has not advised her mother or sister as to her intentions.

Changing Fashions Shown In Books for Children

Influence of Feminism Is Apparent in Girls' Publications; Boys' Books Acquire New Spirit as Result of Ideas Growing Out of the War

By Rebecca Drucker

Any consideration of the changing fashion of children's books must be prefaced by the wholly trite reminder that nothing in child nature has changed in many thousands of years. Children are intensely stable and conservative. What they want now in books they have always wanted, and probably always will want. But the making of books is something in which they have been helpless. It is the work of grown-ups. With rare and noteworthy exceptions, children's books have been written by one parent for another. They bore in mind the parents' need, never the child's. Rollo and Elsie, for instance, are eloquent of the form to which the Victorian adult would have broken the child if he could. What has happened in children's literature in recent years reflects the change in the consciousness of the grown-up, not that of the child.

The most noteworthy change is the recognition that it is not so important to teach the child as to serve him. We are beginning to regard as a little dishonorable the attempt to inculcate purposely knowledge or morals to him in a sugar-coated form. The more highly principled writers of children's books even recognize what bad form it is to patronize the child, to write down to him. Of course, there are still huge quantities of books made for children by people who want to influence him, and as dull and unimaginative and patronizing books are written to-day in the cause of education as anything in the Victorian era. Children's literature is an outgrowth of the philosophy of the French Revolution—the discovery of the child by Rousseau—and child study and children's literature have never quite torn themselves free from the didacticism of its inception.

But there are already new landmarks. A marked change has come about in boys' books due to the war. It has stimulated intensely the interest in scientific and mechanical things—so that the Oliver Optic tales have languished, while a whole body of tales of the air service, of modern science and invention have grown up. One writer of boys' books told me that he could not put in enough technical details to satisfy the curiosity of his readers, and there were no mechanical facts so complicated that boys of today did not seem competent to grasp them. Of course the good adventure story and the historical story are still the backbone of boys' reading. In fact, a curious psychological effect of the war was to send boys back to reading historical romances of every period of the country's history. Joseph Alsop, who writes frontier stories with an unusually accurate historical background, wrote an extremely popular, "The Young Trailers," a Texas series, a series of the French and Indian wars, "The Young Trailers," the "Forest Runners" have had a very wide sale. The tales of the past, though they are no longer the fantastically impossible things they seemed when they were written, still hold the imagination of boys pretty well. They somehow connect up with the present.

The school athletic series have fallen off somewhat in popularity, but boys show a more vigorous interest than ever before in biography, vividly and dramatically told, if the character is some one who stirs their imagination. Albert Bigelow Paine's "Boys' Life of Max Tswai" and Hagelorn's "Life of Roosevelt" are two books to which boys have quickened. And, of course, lives of Lincoln, of Napoleon, of Washington and of any other dynamic figure of history, are always the most standard reading there is for boys.

In a curious way the whole modern woman's movement has affected present-day girls' books. Girls' books have always been inferior to boys'. There was always a more rigorous censorship exercised over girls' books than over the books that boys read. Through them a girl was early taught her limitations

and reminded of what was expected of her. The girls' books of only a dozen years ago were appalling things. They were sedentary and dull and unhealthy self-conscious. They intensified the personal standards of judgment. Has the Girl Scout and the Campfire moved the nature writers know how to present nature to children. Thornton Burgess, whose series of bed-time animal stories have had a very wide popularity, has had the knowledge and the imagination to make animal life absorbing to small children. He got his idea from Beatrix Potter, an Englishwoman, who wrote stories and made pictures illustrating "The Tale of Peter Rabbit." In that to the present nature to children. Thornton Burgess, whose series of bed-time animal stories have had a very wide popularity, has had the knowledge and the imagination to make animal life absorbing to small children. He got his idea from Beatrix Potter, an Englishwoman, who wrote stories and made pictures illustrating "The Tale of Peter Rabbit." In that to the present nature to children. Thornton Burgess, whose series of bed-time animal stories have had a very wide popularity, has had the knowledge and the imagination to make animal life absorbing to small children. He got his idea from Beatrix Potter, an Englishwoman, who wrote stories and made pictures illustrating "The Tale of Peter Rabbit." In that to the present nature to children.

One of the extraordinary growths in juvenile literature has been the development since "The Jungle" Book of animal stories for small children. There is a good reason for their popularity. It lies in the interest of small children in nature and the difficulty of teaching it in any other way. Few of the nature writers know how to present nature to children. Thornton Burgess, whose series of bed-time animal stories have had a very wide popularity, has had the knowledge and the imagination to make animal life absorbing to small children. He got his idea from Beatrix Potter, an Englishwoman, who wrote stories and made pictures illustrating "The Tale of Peter Rabbit." In that to the present nature to children.

This is perhaps not the grade of nature-writing we most need for small children. No government has yet thought fit to follow the example of the Swedish government, which commissioned Selma Lagerlof to gather up the stories of the woods and fields, of the birds and animals and fables of her country into a book for children. It is called "The Wonderful Adventures of Nils," and is, of course, wholly and intimately concerned with the life of Sweden. No other country has ever commissioned a writer of real literary distinction and imagination to do a similar task.

Perhaps a word should be said of the modern treatment of the folk tale. There has somehow grown up the impression that a child is a fragile and sensitive thing, upon whom no rude or robust ideas may blow. It has led to the issuing of compilations of fairy tales which are emasculated of all violence and incidentally of all vividness. I quote from a book advertisement of such a series: "They are free from the savagery, distressing details and excessive pathos which mar many of the tales in the form that they have come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What standard is there to be? It cannot be the standard of what a child should be brought before a child but what is happy and beautiful. We do not want to come down to us from a barbaric past. But there has been no sacrifice of simplicity and humor and sweetness that give them perennial charm." Here is didacticism afoot, only this time from the sentimentalists. What